

percentages of their needs through the exchange? Are there circumstances when it is likely to make business sense for a buyer to participate solely in one B2B electronic marketplace? What factors are relevant to whether a buyer participates in multiple B2B electronic marketplaces selling similar products?

10. What consequences can be expected to follow from a decision to join, or not to join, a B2B electronic marketplace? Do B2B electronic marketplaces have implications for wholesalers or other middlemen? For long-term contracting?

Seller Perspectives

1. What business reasons prompt sellers to be interested in selling through B2B electronic marketplaces? For example, what savings do sellers expect to gain through such marketplaces? How were sales made before the availability of such marketplaces? Are sellers based outside the United States participating in such marketplaces?

2. What are the sources of the expected savings? Are savings expected to come from reductions in transactions costs? From volume-related scale economies? From inventory reductions? From the ability to do business more readily with distant buyers? From other sources?

3. What factors affect the desirability of transacting business through B2B electronic marketplaces and the extent of likely electronic marketplace usage? Does it matter whether the product at issue is homogeneous or differentiated?

4. Does it make a difference to sellers who owns or operates the B2B electronic marketplace? If so, why? How do sellers decide in which marketplaces to participate? What factors affect participation decisions?

5. Are there any increased costs to sellers of doing business in B2B electronic marketplaces? Are any distribution costs increased? What effects will B2B electronic marketplaces likely have on sellers' profit margins?

6. Do sellers see competitors' prices posted on B2B electronic marketplaces? If so, how do sellers respond? What role do computer programs play?

7. What other information, if any, do B2B electronic marketplaces make available to sellers about competing sellers? For example, can sellers receive information about competitors' available capacity?

8. What rules do sellers typically want to govern B2B electronic marketplace solicitations? Are there circumstances when sellers may wish to limit the number or identity of possible

purchasers or otherwise structure auction procedures?

9. Must a minimum level or percentage of sales be made through a B2B electronic marketplace in which a seller participates? Do B2B electronic marketplaces impose any other requirements affecting participants' outside sales?

10. What consequences can be expected to follow from a decision to join, or not to join, a B2B electronic marketplace? Do B2B electronic marketplaces have implications for wholesalers or other middlemen? For long-term contracting?

Public Policy Perspectives

1. What competition issues may be raised by B2B electronic marketplaces? What are likely procompetitive benefits, and what are possible anticompetitive concerns?

2. Under what circumstances are B2B electronic marketplaces likely to increase or diminish competition? What has the experience been so far?

3. How do B2B electronic marketplaces affect entry at the buyer or seller level? How does entry occur in the market for B2B electronic marketplaces?

4. What issues are relevant to structuring and implementing B2B electronic marketplaces so as to both realize efficiencies and avoid competition problems? For example, what mechanisms might be included to prevent inappropriate sharing of competitive, confidential information? Are any of these mechanisms likely to be impractical or undesirable from a business perspective?

5. Does the development of competition within and among B2B electronic marketplaces depend in part on any intellectual property rights relating to the design or operation of such marketplaces?

6. What implications, if any, do B2B electronic marketplaces have for market structure and market concentration?

The Commission welcomes suggestions for other questions that also should be addressed. Proposed questions, identified as such, may be sent by electronic mail to b2bmarketplaces@ftc.gov.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-11604 Filed 5-9-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-P

HARRY S. TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

Notice of Intent To Extend an Information Collection

AGENCY: Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the requirements of section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 for opportunity for public comment on proposed data collection projects, the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation [Foundation] will publish periodic summaries of proposed projects.

Comments are invited on (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or the forms of information technology.

DATES: Written comments on this notice must be received by July 10, 2000 to be assured of consideration. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Contact Louis H. Blair, Executive Secretary, Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation, 712 Jackson Place, NW, Washington, DC 20006; telephone 202-395-4831; or send e-mail to lblair@truman.gov. You also may obtain a copy of the data collection instrument and instructions from Mr. Blair.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title of Collection: Truman Scholar Payment Request Form.

OMB Approval Number: 3200-0005.

Expiration Date of Approval: May 31, 1997.

Type of Request: Intent to seek approval to extend an information collection for three years.

Proposed Project: The Foundation has been providing scholarships since 1977 in compliance with PL 93-642. This data collection instrument is used to collect essential information to enable the Truman Scholarship Foundation to determine the amount of financial support to which each Truman Scholar is eligible and then to make the payment. A total response rate of 100% was provided by the 273 Truman

Scholars who received support in FY 1999.

Estimate of Burden: The Foundation estimates that, on average, 0.5 hours per Scholar applying for funds will be required to complete the Payment Request Form, for a total annual burden of 136.5 hours for all applicants.

Respondents: Individuals.

Estimated Number of Responses: 273.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 136.5 hours.

Dated: May 4, 2000.

Louis H. Blair,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-11726 Filed 5-9-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-AD-M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

[Program Announcement 00063]

Interdisciplinary Evaluation of Combination Therapy for Uncomplicated Malaria; Notice of Availability of Funds

A. Purpose

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) announces the availability of fiscal year (FY) 2000 funds for a cooperative agreement program for Interdisciplinary Evaluations of Combination Therapy for Uncomplicated Malaria. CDC is committed to achieving the health promotion and disease prevention objectives of "Healthy People 2010", a national activity to reduce morbidity and mortality and improve the quality of life. This announcement is related to the focus areas of Immunization and Infectious Diseases. The purpose of the program is to evaluate the effectiveness of combination antimalarial therapy at district or multidistrict level in sub-Saharan Africa.

B. Eligible Applicants

Assistance will be provided only to Ifakara Health and Research Development Center (IHRDC), in Ifakara, United Republic of Tanzania. No other applications are solicited.

The United Republic of Tanzania is the only country located in sub-Saharan Africa where large portions of the country are located in areas of active, and intense, transmission of the parasite *Plasmodium falciparum*. They represent one of only a few countries where drug policy reform is underway because of antimalarial drug resistance and is actively engaged in developing and

testing strategies for addressing the problem of antimalarial drug resistance. Antimalarial drug resistance to chloroquine, the traditional first-line treatment for uncomplicated malaria, has intensified to a point where the Ministry of Health has decided to switch to an alternative medicine, sulfadoxine/pyrimethamine (SP), for first-line treatment of malaria. Because of concerns that this strategy will be short lived due to pre-existing levels of drug resistance to SP, the Ministry of Health is keenly interested in understanding potential future options for addressing this pressing public health challenge.

The IHRDC in Ifakara, Tanzania, is a non-government organization that comes under the jurisdiction of the United Republic of Tanzania, Ministry of Health. The Ministry of Health has oversight of the IHRDC and must approve all actions taken on behalf of the United Republic of Tanzania. IHRDC is the only institution in sub-Saharan Africa that is located in an area of very intense malaria transmission, that is located in a country that is poised to adopt a national malaria treatment policy of SP while actively engaged in investigating future treatment options; is actively engaged in research activities that are directly related to the objectives listed above; and has the needed experience and capacity. Because of its work in malaria for more than a decade, IHRDC is an internationally respected research institution. Investigators at IHRDC have a detailed understanding of the epidemiologic patterns and geographic distribution of malaria infection and transmission in their area, are actively engaged in using state-of-the-art techniques for evaluating antimalarial drug resistance, and have needed and proven expertise in socio-behavioral research related to malaria. In addition, the IHRDC maintains a demographic surveillance system (DSS) covering approximately 55,000 individuals, allowing for measurement of public health impact of malaria treatment policies, and, through its existing collaborative links to other institutions and projects, has the ability to access comparable data from 2 additional DSS data bases (covering a total population of over 300,000 individuals). The IHRDC is the only organization that has the capacity to carry out large-scale community-based public health interventions, to conduct malaria research, and to correctly diagnose drug resistant malaria infections in its laboratories and field activities. They have the required field experience and demonstrated capacity

in areas directly related to all 6 principal objectives of this proposed evaluation: (1) Using state-of-the-art methods of diagnosing antimalarial drug resistance, including in vivo, in vitro, and molecular methods; (2) monitoring for changes in gametocytemia rates; (3) socio-behavioral research related to malaria, malaria drug use practices, and malaria treatment seeking practices; (4) economics of malaria and malaria treatment; (5) research into the process development of public health policy related to malaria; and (6) monitoring for public health impact, including on a population level.

C. Availability of Funds

Approximately \$500,000 is available in FY 2000 to fund one award. It is expected that the award will begin on or about August 30, 2000, and will be made for a 12-month budget period within a project period of up to five years. The funding estimate may change.

Continuation awards within an approved project period may be made on the basis of satisfactory progress as evidenced by required reports and the availability of funds.

D. Program Requirements

In conducting activities to achieve the purpose of this program, the recipient will be responsible for conducting the activities under 1. (Recipient Activities) and CDC will be responsible for conducting the activities under 2. (CDC Activities).

1. Recipient Activities

a. Identify an appropriate set of districts for the evaluation of a pilot policy of antimalarial combination therapy, including comparison areas using SP monotherapy for treatment of all cases of uncomplicated malaria.

b. Design a multifaceted evaluation program to determine the effectiveness of antimalarial combination therapy on inhibiting development of drug resistance and decreasing malaria transmission, as well as to elucidate programmatic, behavioral, economic, or policy aspects of combination therapy that could either enhance or limit this effectiveness.

c. Define, collect, and analyze baseline data: Collect baseline data so that the public health impact of the interventions can be evaluated (including impact on mortality rates).

d. Carry out the evaluation activities.

e. Measure the effect of the national treatment policy compared with the pilot policy of combination therapy in terms of (1) inhibiting the development of resistance to SP; (2) interrupting